



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/207,634	12/09/1998	JOSEPH J. BERKE	1374-098	7083

7590 05/23/2005  
ALEX RHODES  
30100 TELEGRAPH ROAD STE 460  
BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025

EXAMINER

AVERY, BRIDGET D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3618

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/207,634	BERKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bridget Avery	3618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-14 and 20-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-14 and 20-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |



### DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed by applicant on December 2, 2004 is acknowledged and has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 5-8, 10, 20, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor (US Patent 4,160,557).

Taylor teaches the combination of a 2-wheel cart, a carrier mounted on an upper portion of the cart capable of gripping an upper portion of a closed bag or sack containing quantities of loose and granular products, such as sand and trash, the carrier having a pair of elongated jaws capable of gripping and supporting a closed upper portion of the bag or sack, and a means (it is inherent that the clamps are spring loaded) for clamping the jaws to and releasing the jaws from an upper portion of the closed bag or sack, and a handle attached to each of the jaws, as clearly shown in Figure 1. The cart has a selectively foldable lower shelf, as shown in Figure 2, for supporting the bag or sack. The carrier (66) is detachable from the 2-wheel cart. At least one of the jaws has a gripping surface (applicant's attention is directed to the

Art Unit: 3618

surface engaging the upper bag support 50) for retaining and supporting the upper portion of the closed bag or sack.

3. Claims 5-7, 10, 20, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harmon et al. (US Patent 524,041).

Harmon et al. teaches the combination of a 2-wheel cart (1), a carrier (made of yokes/jaws 10, 13) mounted on an upper portion of the cart (1) capable of transporting a closed bag or sack (not shown, however clearly taught on lines 10, 13, 38, 40, 50, 54) containing quantities of loose and granular products, such as sand and trash, the carrier having a pair of elongated yokes/jaws (10, 13), and a means (one yoke/jaw pivoting to overlies the second yoke/jaw to hold the bag) for clamping the yokes/jaws (10, 13) to and releasing the yokes/jaws (10, 13) from an upper portion of the closed bag or sack, and a handle (14) attached to one of the yokes/jaws (10, 13), as clearly shown in Figures 1 and 2. The cart (1) has a lower shelf/bar (5), as shown in Figure 2, capable of supporting the bag or sack. The carrier (1) is detachable from the 2-wheel cart by removing fasteners in hinges (8) from the cross bar (6). At least one of the yokes/jaws (10, 13) has a gripping surface (applicant's attention is directed to the outer surface of yoke/jaw (10) and the inner surface of yoke/jaw (13)) for retaining and supporting the upper portion of the closed bag or sack.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor ('557) in view of Hull (US Patent 3,400,942).

Taylor teaches the features described above.

Taylor lacks the teaching of an outwardly adjustable shelf and a cart with a height that is adjustable.

Hull teaches a cart having an outwardly adjustable shelf and a cart with telescoping tubes to adjust the height of the cart.

Based on the teachings of Hull, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the cart of Taylor to include a telescoping outwardly adjustable shelf to permit the transport of larger loads. It would have been obvious to provide the cart with telescoping tubes to adjust the height of the cart to accommodate users of various heights.

5. Claims 21-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor ('557) in view of Cotey et al. (US Patent 5,009,657).

Taylor teaches the features described above.

Taylor lacks the teaching of a metal strip having a plurality of outward extending triangular tabs.

Cotey et al. teaches a clamping device including a metal strip having a plurality of outward extending triangular tabs.

Based on the teachings of Cotey et al., it would have been obvious to modify the clamp of Taylor to include a metal strip having a plurality of outward extending triangular tabs to aid in securing the clamp to the bag and resisting slippage as the bag is being transported.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. Claim 13 is allowed.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed December 2, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's remarks, the cart and carrier of Taylor is clearly capable of gripping the upper portion of a closed bag or sack using any one of clamps 66. The section of the Taylor reference (column 1, lines 64-68) of which applicant relies, fails to teach away from using the clamps 66 to grip closed bags or sacks.
9. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the clamping devices are similar in structure and functionality.

10. In response to applicant's argument that the umbilical cord cutting and clamping device is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the umbilical cord cutting and clamping device is concerned, just like applicant, with securely gripping an object.

### **Conclusion**


11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3618

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Bridget Avery at telephone number 571-272-6691.

  
Avery

May 16, 2005



CHRISTOPHER P. ELLIS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 8320